Über-Gravity and the Cosmological Constant Problem

Nima Khosravi[1,*]

[1]*Department of Physics, Shahid Beheshti University, G.C., Evin, Tehran 19839, Iran*

(Dated: March 17, 2017)

Recently, the idea of taking ensemble average over gravity models has been introduced. Based on this idea, we study the ensemble average over (effectively) all the gravity models dubbing the name übergravity. The übergravity has interesting universal properties, independent from the choice of basis: *i*) it mimics Einstein-Hilbert gravity for high-curvature regime, *ii*) it predicts stronger gravitational force for an intermediate-curvature regime, *iii*) surprisingly, for low-curvature regime, i.e. $R < R_0$ where R is Ricci scalar and R_0 is a given scale, the Lagrangian vanishes automatically and *iiii*) there is a sharp transition between low- and intermediate-curvature regimes at $R = R_0$. We show that the übergravity response is robust to all values of vacuum energy, ρ_{vac}. This means the response to any non-vanishing value of ρ_{vac} gives an exact deSitter solution where R_0 plays the role of the cosmological constant. Consequently, R_0 should be determined by observations and there is no need to fine-tune the cosmological constant.

arXiv:1703.02052v2 [gr-qc] 16 Mar 2017

Introduction: A century ago Einstein introduced the cosmological constant (CC) to address static universe [1] which became his biggest blunder after Hubble's discovery of expanding universe. On the other hand, from the viewpoint of particle physics it is well-known that there is a non-vanishing vacuum energy, ρ_{vac}, which has no effect on most of particle physics' calculations. But in presence of gravity, it predicts an inflating universe which is not compatible with the observations before 1998. Accordingly it raised a question: why the vacuum energy has no effect on gravity? which is known as old CC-problem. Data acquired by Sueprnovae observations in 1998 [2] and recent Plank data [3] implies a tiny value for CC, which shall be 120 orders of magnitude smaller than ρ_{vac}; this prediction sometimes will refer to as "the worst theoretical prediction in the history of physics" [4]. To solve this discrepancy a fine-tuning is required which is known as the new CC-problem (CCP) [5].

There are three different approaches to solve the CCP: *i*) modifying the Einstein-Hilbert (EH) model in a way that gravity becomes insensitive to ρ_{vac} [6], *ii*) revising field theory calculation of ρ_{vac} [7] and *iii*) connecting the CCP (which is in IR regime) to UV-completion of gravity [8]. An idea in the context of modifying gravity is degravitation which proposes switching off the gravity for very large wavelengths and consequently filters ρ_{vac} [9]. It is worth mentioning that some believes old CCP shall be addressed before moving to new CCP. This idea is supported by 'tHooft conjecture: if the gravitational effects of ρ_{vac} can be canceled by a symmetry then a tiny fluctuation from this symmetric situation is natural. Supersymmetry is an idea in this direction assuming the presence of a boson particle for each fermion consequently paving the way for a mechanism to eliminate ρ_{vac} [10].

In this Letter, we will study the CCP within the context of über-modeling introduced in [11]. We try to show that über-modeling of (effectively) all gravitational models eliminates gravity for low-curvature regimes which can be interpreted as degravitation. Our model coincides with the EH model in high-curvature regime although, there is an intermediate-curvature regime where gravity is stronger than the standard EH model. It will be shown that our model is not sensitive to value of vacuum energy, ρ_{vac}, thanks to a sharp (but continuous) transition from low- to intermediate-curvature regime. Interestingly, this means there is no need of fine-tuning and the CC is "natural".

Über-gravity: In [11], we introduced an idea based on ensemble average of models within the context of gravity. According to this idea, we start with the space of all consistent models of gravity, $\mathbb{M}$, and then take an ensemble average over all models. This idea is inspired by statistical mechanics which employed in a very different context. In [12], Arkani-Hamed et al. employed a similar idea to address the hierarchy problem in particle physics. They mention that in principle an average should be taken on all possible models but for simplicity, they just considered the standard model with different Higgs masses. To make über-modelling idea applicable, we assigned a Lagrangian to each model and ensemble average of all the Lagrangians was introduced as following:

$$\mathcal{L} = \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{L}_i e^{-\beta \mathcal{L}_i}\Big) \Big/ \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{N} e^{-\beta \mathcal{L}_i}\Big), \qquad (1)$$

where β is a free parameter and model space is represented by $\mathbb{M} = \{\mathcal{L}_i \mid i \in \{1, N\}\}$ while N is number of all possible models. In [11] we assumed $\mathbb{M} = \{R, G\}$ where R is the Ricci scalar and G is the Gauss-Bonnet term. In this Letter we generalize the model space to (effectively) all the gravity models: $\mathbb{M} = \{R^n \mid \forall\, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. This means $\mathbb{M}$ contains the basis of all analytic $f(R)$. In the following we will apply über-modeling recipe (1) for $\mathbb{M}$. The ensemble averaged Lagrangian takes the follow-

*Electronic address: n-khosravi@sbu.ac.ir



FIG. 1: Blue line is our Lagrangian (2) where we do sum up to $N = 1000$ (It is easy to see that for larger N's the plot is practically the same.) and yellow dashed line shows the EH action for comparison. The universal behavior of our model is obvious: i) in high-curvature regime our model coincides with the EH model, ii) in intermediate-curvature regime where gravity is stronger than the EH model, iii) for $R < R_0$ gravity vanishes and iiii) there is a sharp transition at $R = R_0$.



FIG. 2: Blue line shows our Lagrangian (2) where $\beta = 0.01$ while yellow dashed line represents the EH action for comparison. This plot demonstrates that our model has non-trivial features in its intermediate-curvature regime depending on the value of β. However we emphasize that the universal features are the same as $\beta = 1$ case, see FIG. 1.

ing form

$$\mathcal{L} = \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \bar{R}^n e^{-\beta \bar{R}^n}\right) \Big/ \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\beta \bar{R}^n}\right), \tag{2}$$

where $\bar{R} = R/R_0$. This model has two free parameters: R_0 and dimensionless β. In FIG.1, the above Lagrangian is plotted for $\beta = 1$. The above Lagrangian can be written in a more compact form as

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{d}{d\beta} ln\mathcal{Z}, \qquad \mathcal{Z} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\beta \bar{R}^n} \tag{3}$$

which reminds us of the partition function and its relation to energy. The above Lagrangian belongs to the $f(R)$ family and effectively is ensemble average of all possible models of gravity based on the curvature tensor. Note that in a general case we could work with all possible linear combinations e.g. $\mathcal{L} = \alpha_1 R + \alpha_2 R^4$ with two constants α_1 and α_2. It is easy to observe that adding such terms do not change the interesting aspects of the model, so without loss of generality we focus on the above Lagrangian. Only difference will be in the form of the Lagrangian over the intermediate-curvature regime while for both high- and low-curvature regimes nothing is changed. Even in the intermediate-curvature regime the general prediction is a stronger gravity compared to the EH model. However, the form of our model in the intermediate-curvature regime is sensitive to the parameter β. As an example FIG.2 shows the Lagrangian (2) for $\beta = 0.01$ which represents a very different behavior in intermediate-curvature regime.

In summary, the übergravity model has the following universal properties (independent to the choice of basis i.e. $\mathbb{M}$):

- for high-curvature regime it reduces to the EH action,
- for intermediate-curvature regime it predicts a stronger gravity than the EH model,
- it is vanishing for low-curvature regime ($R < R_0$),
- there is a sharp transition at R_0.

It is worth mentioning that adding the übergravity (2) to $\mathbb{M}$ and re-employing the übermodelling procedure cannot affect above universal features [17]. In addition above properties are shared for all values of β.

Equations of Motion: For a general $f(R)$ model the equation of motion is as follow [13]:

$$\Sigma_{\mu\nu} = \kappa^2 T_{\mu\nu}$$

where

$$\Sigma_{\mu\nu} = F(R)R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} f(R)\, g_{\mu\nu} + \Big(g_{\mu\nu}\Box - \nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu\Big) F(R),$$

$F(R) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial R}$ and $T_{\mu\nu}$ is the energy-momentum tensor. In our case $F(R)$ can be written as:

$$F(R) = \frac{\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} R^n e^{-\beta R^n}\right) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \beta n R^{n-1} e^{-\beta R^n}}{\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\beta R^n}\right)^2} - \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\beta n R^{2n-1} e^{-\beta R^n} - n R^{n-1} e^{-\beta R^n}\right)}{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\beta R^n}}.$$

It is obvious from the above relations, our model is very complicated for analytical calculations. In the next section we introduce a simplified model which shares all the interesting properties of our model.

Simplified Model: The following model has the same features in all the curvature regimes [18]

$$f(R) = \begin{cases} \bar{R}^n & R \leq R_0 \\ \bar{R} + e^{-(\bar{R}-0.7)} & R_0 < R \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

where for the limit $n \to \infty$ the low-curvature regime shares exactly the same feature with our model, see FIG.1. Note that here the exponential term is added phenomenologically to $R_0 < R$ region to recover the intermediate-curvature behavior. For our purpose, we focus on low-curvature regime. It is easy to see that the equation of motion for the low-curvature part is [14]:

$$\Sigma_{\mu\nu} = \tag{5}$$
$$n\,\bar{R}^{n-1}\bar{R}_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}\bar{R}^n\,g_{\mu\nu} + n\,R_0^{-1}\Big(g_{\mu\nu}\Box - \nabla_\mu\nabla_\nu\Big)\bar{R}^{n-1}$$

where $\bar{R}_{\mu\nu} = R_0^{-1}R_{\mu\nu}$. Obviously for high-curvature regime the model reduces to Einstein's gravity. In the next section based on this model we will show how this model can give us a proposal to resolve the CCP.

An attempt to solve the CCP: To address the CCP we need to take care of the vacuum energy, ρ_{vac}, in presence of gravity. To do this we need to recall that ρ_{vac} is encoded in the trace of energy-momentum tensor, T. By looking at (5) it is easy to see that the trace of equations of motion yields:

$$(n-2)\bar{R}^n + 3\,n\,R_0^{-1}\,\Box\,\bar{R}^{n-1} = \kappa^2 T. \tag{6}$$

We are interested in solutions like $R = cte$ since for our purpose T is vacuum expectation value which is a constant. With this assumption the above equation reduces to

$$\frac{R}{R_0} = \left(\frac{\kappa^2\,T}{n-2}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}}. \tag{7}$$

For all $T \neq 0$; limits of equation (7) for $n \to \infty$ results in $R \to R_0$. This is a very interesting result which means the model's response to the vacuum energy is robust i.e. gravity sector is not sensitive to ρ_{vac}. In other words, the cosmological constant value R_0, shall be fixed only by observation without fine-tuning. Such will imply that the cosmological constant value is natural and the CCP can be solved by this approach. More interestingly, this result is not valid for zero vacuum energy which means particle physics' prediction for non-zero vacuum energy is crucial for our model.

A subtlety: Above argument contains a subtlety which we shall clarify herein. The point is that by definition



FIG. 3: Blue line is the trace of equation of motion in übergravity where $\beta = 1$ and yellow dashed line shows the same for the EH action. Obviously at $R = R_0$ the trace goes asymptotically to positive infinity. It is clear that for positive ρ_{vac} there is only the EH's solution while for any $\rho_{vac} < 0$, $R = R_0$ is the solution.

$T \propto -\rho_{vac}$ where $\rho_{vac} > 0$; the negative sign is the origin of problem. In the EH model, trace of equation of motion gives $-R = \kappa^2 T$ hence $R = \kappa^2\rho_{vac}$. But in our scenario (7) for any $n > 2$ we have $(-\rho_{vac})^{1/n}$ on the right hand side of equation. Now the question is what is value of $(-1)^{1/n}$ for $n \to \infty$? For any given n there are n solutions in complex plane and none of them is exactly one. For sure there is a solution which is as close as possible to one but the infinitesimal difference always has an imaginary part. This behavior is shared between both simplified model (4) and the übergravity (3). To illustrate this fact, we plot the trace of equations of motion for übergravity in FIG. 3. We believe that this issue can be addressed by full analysis of the analytical continuation of our model but its concrete study remains open for future investigations. Hereby we will try to give some ideas which can resolve this problem and hopefully guide us to a concrete proposal to solve the CCP.

Towards a Proposal to Solve the CCP: Here we will try to give two proposals to resolve the above subtlety:

I: Particle Physics approach: The negative sign in $T = -\rho_{vac}$ in standard particle physics is because of larger number of fermionic degrees of freedom compared to bosonic counterpart. String theory predicts new species like axions [15], which are candidates for dark matter [16]. The axions are bosons which means if one calculates the axion's contribution to the vacuum energy then ρ_{vac} can be negative. As it is obvious from FIG. 3 for a negative ρ_{vac} we have $R = R_0$ as a solution. As mentioned above, this solution is not sensitive to any value of ρ_{vac} which means there is no need to fine-tuning.

II: Über-Gravity approach: This approach suggests to modify the gravity model. As it is clear from FIG. 3 what we need is an asymptotic behavior with an opposite sign at $R = R_0$. For this purpose, we modify our model



FIG. 4: Blue line is the trace of equation of motion in the modified model (8) where $\beta = 1$ and yellow dashed line shows the same for the EH action. Obviously, at $R = R_0$ the trace goes to negative infinity and comes up to positive infinity asymptotically. In this scenario for $\rho_{vac} > 0$ we get two solutions: $R = R_0$ and $R = \rho_{vac}$. The $R = \rho_{vac}$ solution is same as the EH solution which is not in agreement with the observations. But, the solution $R = R_0$ is the one which can be compatible with observations. This solution is not sensitive to the value of ρ_{vac} which means there is no need to fine-tuning and the CC is natural.

(3) phenomenologically by multiplying it by a hyperbolic tangent function:

$$\mathcal{L} = \tanh\left[N(\bar{R}-1)\right] \times \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \bar{R}^n e^{-\beta \bar{R}^n}}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} e^{-\beta \bar{R}^n}}. \qquad (8)$$

Obviously tanh function changes its sign at $R = R_0$ and behaves as a step function while $N \to \infty$. Using tanh function instead of step function makes our Lagrangian continuous which is useful for future purposes. For this model the trace of equation of motion is plotted in FIG. 4. In this scenario for a positive ρ_{vac} there are two distinguishable solutions $R = T$ and $R = R_0$. The $R = T$ solution is exactly the EH solution which is not compatible with the observations. But the $R = R_0$ solution is the solution which is not sensitive to ρ_{vac}'s value and makes the CC natural.

Discussions and concluding remarks: Based on the über-modelling idea [11] we calculated ensemble average of (effectively) all gravity models. This procedure results in an effective Lagrangian (2) which has interesting features shown in FIG.1. Below we briefly summarize übergravity properties:

- There is a universal prediction for our model which does not depend on the choice of β: At high-curvature regime it is the EH gravity which can be crucial to address the local tests. There is always a stronger gravity in an intermediate-curvature regime. For low-curvature regime, $R < R_0$, the gravity is vanishing which can be interpreted as degravitation. Consequently, a sharp transition occurs at $R = R_0$.

- For any (non-zero) value of ρ_{vac} our model predicts an exact deSitter solution i.e. $R = R_0$. This is an interesting result since observations support deSitter background.

- If $\rho_{vac} = 0$ then our model gives a Minkowski spacetime instead of deSitter spacetime which is not compatible with observations.

- If our model is correct in its current form then dark matter species should be bosons e.g. axions.

- We assume our model works effectively up to Planck mass scale i.e. quantum gravity scale. This means, up to that scale, we do not need to take care of quantum gravity corrections and may conceive our model as a classical field theory. This means even loop corrections to ρ_{vac} cannot change our conclusions and there is no need for infinite regularizing counter terms to keep R_0 fixed.

There are several ways to pursue this idea which are beyond the scope of this Letter and remain open for further investigations:

- ⋆ Making the übermodelling idea more concrete by focusing on its mathematical foundations.

- ⋆ One specific way to shed light on our model is to calculate effective Newtonian constant. It is doable by a conformal transformation and going from $f(R)$ frame to Brans-Dicke frame.

- ⋆ Doing perturbation theory of our model and examine the results by observations. This is a crucial test for our model since at the level of background, the solution is exact deSitter which is same as the ΛCDM.

- ⋆ Focusing on the intermediate-curvature regime which seems potentially attractive. Stronger gravity may address the production of massive black holes in high-redshifts. In addition since the intermediate regime is very close to R_0 (which should be fixed by Hubble parameter) then we expect to have features on e.g. CMB in scales very close to Hubble's scale.

- ⋆ We can extend our proposal to other kind of models e.g. Horndeski Lagrangians.

Acknowledgments: I would like to thank M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari for very fruitful discussions and useful comments. I am also grateful to S. Baghram, T. Koivisto, A. Nicolis,

A. A. Saberi and S. Shahbazian for useful comments. I thank K. Jahan for carefully reading the paper. I also thank School of Physics at IPM for their hospitality during a part of this work.

[1] A. Einstein, "Kosmologische Betrachtungen zur allgemeinen Relativitaetstheorie", Sitzungsberichte der Kniglich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Berlin, part 1 (1917) 142152.

[2] Supernova Search Team, "Observational evidence from supernovae for an accelerating universe and a cosmological constant", Astron.J. 116 (1998) 1009-1038, astro-ph/9805201,
Supernova Cosmology Project, "Measurements of Omega and Lambda from 42 high redshift supernovae", Astrophys.J. 517 (1999) 565-586, astro-ph/9812133.

[3] Planck Collaboration, "Planck 2015 results. XIII. Cosmological parameters", Astron.Astrophys. 594 (2016) A13, arXiv:1502.01589 [astro-ph.CO].

[4] M. P. Hobson, G. P. Efstathiou and A. N. Lasenby,"General Relativity: An introduction for physicists" Cambridge University Press, 2006.

[5] S. Weinberg, "The cosmological constant problem, Review of Modern Physics 61 (1989) 1,
J. Martin, "Everything You Always Wanted To Know About The Cosmological Constant Problem (But Were Afraid To Ask)", Comptes Rendus Physique 13 (2012) 566, arXiv:1205.3365 [astro-ph.CO],
A. Padilla, "Lectures on the Cosmological Constant Problem", arXiv:1502.05296 [hep-th].

[6] N. Kaloper and A. Padilla, "Sequestering the Standard Model Vacuum Energy", Phys.Rev.Lett. 112 (2014) no.9, 091304, arXiv:1309.6562 [hep-th],
L. Smolin, "The Quantization of unimodular gravity and the cosmological constant problems", Phys.Rev. D80 (2009) 084003, arXiv:0904.4841 [hep-th].

[7] N. Arkani-Hamed and S. Dimopoulos, "Supersymmetric unification without low energy supersymmetry and signatures for fine-tuning at the LHC", JHEP 0506 (2005) 073, hep-th/0405159.

[8] R. Sundrum, "Towards an Effective Particle-String Resolution of the Cosmological Constant Problem", JHEP 9907:001 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9708329.

[9] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, G. Dvali and G. Gabadadze, "Nonlocal modification of gravity and the cosmological constant problem", hep-th/0209227,
G. Dvali, S. Hofmann and J. Khoury, "Degravitation of the cosmological constant and graviton width", Phys.Rev. D76 (2007) 084006, hep-th/0703027.

[10] S. P. Martin,"A Supersymmetry primer", Adv.Ser.Direct.High Energy Phys. 21 (2010) 1-153, hep-ph/9709356.

[11] N. Khosravi, "Ensemble Average Theory of Gravity", Phys.Rev. D94 (2016) no.12, 124035, arXiv:1606.01887 [gr-qc].

[12] N. Arkani-Hamed, T. Cohen, R. T. D'Agnolo, A. Hook, H. D. Kim and D. Pinner, "Solving the Hierarchy Problem at Reheating with a Large Number of Degrees of Freedom", Phys.Rev.Lett. 117 (2016) no.25, 251801, arXiv:1607.06821 [hep-ph].

[13] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, "f(R) theories", Living Rev. Rel. 13: 3, 2010, arXiv:1002.4928 [gr-qc].

[14] S. Carloni, P. K. S. Dunsby, S. Capozziello and A. Troisi, "Cosmological dynamics of R^n gravity", Class. Quant. Grav. 22 (2005) 4839-4868, gr-qc/0410046.

[15] D. J. E. Marsh, "Axion Cosmology", Phys.Rept. 643 (2016) 1-79, arXiv:1510.07633 [astro-ph.CO],
P. Svrcek and E. Witten, "Axions In String Theory", JHEP 0606 (2006) 051, hep-th/0605206.

[16] L. Hui, J. P. Ostriker, S. Tremaine and E. Witten, "Ultralight scalars as cosmological dark matter", Phys.Rev. D95 (2017) no.4, 043541, arXiv:1610.08297 [astro-ph.CO].

[17] We thank S. Baghram for pointing out this issue.

[18] We would like to thank Alberto Nicolis because this idea emerged after a discussion with him at the CERN.